

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 TRACY LEE HURST-CASTL,

4 Plaintiff

5 v.

6 SABLES, LLC, et al.,

7 Defendants

Case No.: 2:25-cv-00752-APG-NJK

Order Denying Motions to Remand

[ECF Nos. 6, 11]

8 Tracy Lee Hurst-Castl moves to remand this case to state court for three reasons:

9 (1) Sables, LLC is a Nevada entity and as a forum defendant it cannot remove the case, (2) the
10 amount in controversy does not exceed \$75,000, and (3) Sables did not timely file a Statement
11 Regarding Removal. ECF Nos. 6, 11. None of these reasons justifies remand.

12 Sables is a Nevada limited liability company. “[A]n LLC is a citizen of every state of
13 which its owners/members are citizens.” *Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP*, 437 F.3d
14 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006). Hurst-Castl does not dispute that Sables’ sole member is a California
15 citizen. Rather, she alleges that Sables conducts its business in Nevada. But “the locations at
16 which partnerships conduct business” are irrelevant to subject-matter jurisdiction. *Lincoln Prop.*
17 *Co. v. Roche*, 546 U.S. 81, 84 n.1 (2005) (citation omitted). Because Sables is deemed a citizen
18 of California, the forum-defendant rule is not violated. *Id.* at 84.

19 Hurst-Castl’s lawsuit seeks equitable and declaratory relief to void a foreclosure sale. “In
20 cases seeking injunctive relief from a foreclosure sale, the value of the property at issue is the
21 object of the litigation for the purposes of determining the amount in controversy.” *Kehoe v.*
22 *Aurora Loan Servs. LLC*, No. 3:10-cv-00256-RCJ, 2010 WL 4286331, at *4 (D. Nev. Oct. 20,
23

1 2010). Here, the subject property sold for nearly \$1 million, so this court's \$75,000
2 jurisdictional minimum is satisfied and I can exercise diversity jurisdiction over the case.

3 Finally, Hurst-Castl contends that remand is required because Sables did not timely file
4 its Statement Regarding Removal. ECF No. 11 at 3. But that statement is not jurisdictional, so a
5 late filing does not justify remand.

6 I THEREFORE ORDER that the motions to remand **(ECF Nos. 6, 11) are denied.**

7 DATED this 17th day of June, 2025.

8 

9 _____
10 ANDREW P. GORDON
11 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23